

U.S.S.N. 08/630,383
Filed April 10, 1996

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees, including extension fees or other relief which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.06-1300 (Our Order No. A-55320-2/DJB/TAL/DCF).

AMENDMENTS

Please cancel claims ~~3, 5/9-11~~ and ~~13~~ without prejudice or disclaimer as drawn to non-elected invention.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-8 are pending. Claims 3, 5, 9-11 and 13 are canceled as drawn to a non-elected invention. For the Examiner's convenience a copy of the pending claims is appended hereto as Appendix A.

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 112

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for lack of enablement. Basically the Examiner suggests that the breadth of the claimed invention is not enabled in view of the specification because the claims encompass a method for human therapy. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Enablement

The enablement requirement is that "the specification must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without 'undue' experimentation." see MPEP 2164.08 citing *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993). A rejection based on lack of enablement can constitute a general enablement rejection, which is typically indicated by the use of the language that the specification fails to teach how to make and use the invention as claimed. Alternatively, an enablement rejection can constitute a rejection where the specification fails to teach those in the art to make and use the invention as broadly as it is claimed without undue experimentation. *In re Cortright* 165 F.3d 1353, 49